UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA SOUTHERN DIVISION

RONDA HORSLEY,

Civ. 19- 4092

Plaintiff,

v.

HEART HOSPITAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA, LLC, a North Carolina Limited Liability Company, d/b/a, AVERA HEART HOSPITAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA and PAUL E. MEYER, MD,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, Ronda Horsley, for her causes of action against Defendants, Heart Hospital of South Dakota, LLC, a North Carolina Limited Liability Company, doing business as Avera Heart Hospital of South Dakota, and Paul E. Meyer, MD, states and alleges on information and belief as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 1. The matter arises out of a medical procedure performed on Plaintiff by Defendant, Paul Meyer, MD (hereinafter "Meyer"), at a facility operated by Heart Hospital of South Dakota, LLC, a North Carolina Limited Liability Company, doing business in the State of South Dakota under the business name "Avera Heart Hospital of South Dakota" (hereinafter "Avera Heart Hospital"), in Sioux Falls, Minnehaha County, South Dakota on or about February 28, 2018.
 - 2. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of Iowa.
- 3. Avera Heart Hospital is a North Carolina limited liability company and was organized for the purpose of providing health care and at all times material hereto was in fact

providing health care and hospital services including thoracic surgery services in Minnehaha County, South Dakota, and at all times material, had as its employee and agent, nurses, physicians and other health care staff including Defendant, Meyer, who were all responsible for the care and treatment of Plaintiff, and who were acting within the scope of their employment, thus subjecting Defendant to vicarious liability for the acts and omissions of all its agents and employees in addition to its own liability.

- 4. On information and belief, Meyer is a resident of the State of South Dakota.
- 5. At all relevant times, Meyer was licensed to practice medicine in South Dakota, and he held himself out to the public to be competent, careful and experienced in the specialty of thoracic surgery and was at all times material the agent of Defendant Avera Heart Hospital and acting within the scope of his agency.
- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 because there exists complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and Defendants and the amount in controversy claimed by Plaintiff, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000).
- 7. Venue is proper in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the acts of Defendants complained of occurred in Minnehaha County, South Dakota against Plaintiff as more fully set forth herein.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 8. At all relevant times, Defendant had a duty to comply with accepted standards of practice in providing medical care and treatment to Plaintiff.
- 9. On January 26, 2018, Plaintiff was determined to have a nodular change in the upper lobe of her right lung by Yankton pulmonologist, Michael Pietila, MD.

- 10. Dr. Pietila charted, "I will refer her to the thoracic surgeon for consideration of wedge excision *via thoracoscopy* and if indeed malignancy is confirmed then right upper lobectomy."
- 11. Dr. Pietila specifically charted, "I think it would be very difficult to biopsy transthoracically".
- 12. On February 14, 2018, Plaintiff met with Meyer at Avera Heart Hospital where Meyer explained that he would proceed in the manner described by Dr. Pietila using a minimally invasive scope to biopsy the nodule and then if the nodule was determined to be malignant, remove the upper right lobe of the lung. Meyer charted that plan as:

PLAN: We will schedule for right *thoracoscopy* with wedge resection and *possible conversion to open* for completion lobectomy.

- 13. Thoracoscopy is a minimally invasive surgery unlike a thoracotomy which is performed transthoracically and requires an invasive incision through the chest wall and spreading the patient's ribs.
- 14. On February 27, 2018, the day before surgery, Meyer and Avera Heart Hospital secured the written consent for surgery from Plaintiff for, "*Right thoracoscopy* with wedge resection, excisional biopsy of lung nodule."
- 15. On February 28, 2018, the morning of surgery, Avera Heart Hospital anesthesia described the procedure to Plaintiff as a thoracoscopy and the Pre-Anesthesia Evaluation stated, "Surgical Procedure: R *Thoracoscopy*."
- 16. Meyer, just prior to surgery, told Plaintiff that he was certain that her lung nodule was cancerous even though Meyer could not possibly know the status of the lung nodule without pathological evaluation. Meyer failed to disclose to Plaintiff that he could not definitively know

that the lung nodule was cancerous absent pathological evaluation, and, based on Meyer's failure to disclose this material information, convinced Plaintiff at the very last minute to abandon the established minimally invasive surgical plan for a transthoracic approach.

- 17. At the time of surgery, Meyer did not perform the minimally invasive thoracoscopy that was recommended by Dr. Pietila, specified in Meyer's dictated surgical plan and contained in the written surgical consent form signed by Plaintiff, but instead performed the invasive thoracotomy without any necessary pathology analysis to determine whether Plaintiff even had cancer.
- 18. After performing a wedge resection to biopsy the nodule, Meyer did send tissue to pathology for a determination of whether any cancer was present.
- 19. However, without waiting to learn the results of the pathology, Meyer, consistent with his reckless belief that he could diagnose cancer without any tissue, proceeded to "mobilize" Plaintiffs upper right lobe for removal by performing unnecessary and unconsented to dissection and ligation of structures and unnecessarily exposing the surface of anatomical structures thus exposing Plaintiff to surgical trauma, adhesions and risk.
- 20. While Meyer was working to remove Plaintiff's upper right lobe, pathology determined that the nodule was not cancerous and that Meyer was, in fact, mobilizing a healthy lobe for removal.
- 21. Following the procedure, Plaintiff developed a persistent air leak from the lung that caused severe and painful subcutaneous air in Plaintiff's arms, legs, chest and face.
 - 22. Prior to the air leak, Plaintiff's face looked like this:

23. Plaintiff's condition was ignored until Plaintiff was experiencing excruciating pain and her face looked like this:



24. On March 4, 2018, a different surgeon, Steven Feldhaus, MD, finally returned Plaintiff to surgery and placed a chest tube for decompression of pneumothorax and severe subcutaneous emphysema and first disclosed to Plaintiff what Meyer had done.

CAUSES OF ACTION

- 25. Defendants conduct herein described was a radical departure from the applicable standard of care and constituted negligence and failure to obtain informed consent.
- 26. Meyer knew that he could not definitively state that Plaintiff's lung nodule was cancerous absent pathological evaluation. Plaintiff relied on Meyer's intentional or reckless nondisclosure to her detriment.
- 27. Plaintiff would not have signed the last minute surgical consent form absent Meyer's failure to disclose material information.
- 28. As a result of Meyer's intentional, reckless, or negligent deceit, Plaintiff suffered damages.

- 29. Meyer's conduct in performing an unnecessary thoracotomy and unnecessary and unconsented to mobilization without the informed consent of Plaintiff, constituted a battery against Plaintiff as unconsented to and offensive touching of her body.
- 30. Defendant's conduct was a direct and substantial cause of Plaintiff's injuries and complications, past and future.
- 31. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and/or will suffer damages in excess of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000), as follows:
 - A. Physical injuries and physical pain, past and future;
 - B. Past and future medical and associated expenses;
 - C. Permanent scarring, impairment and disability;
 - D. Great mental pain and inconvenience, past and future; and
 - E. Loss of the normal pleasures of life to which she was formally accustomed.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests a judgment against the Defendant in an amount in excess of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000), as follows:

- 1. For general damages in an amount which the jury determines is just and proper;
- 2. For Plaintiff's special damages in an amount which the jury determines is just and proper;
- 3. For punitive damages;
- 4. For Plaintiff's costs and disbursements herein;
- 5. For prejudgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and,
- 6. For any other and future relief which the Court determines is just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all claims and issues so triable.

Dated this 22nd day of May, 2019.

BRENDTRO LAW FIRM, P.C.

/s/ Robert D. Trzynka

Robert D. Trzynka Daniel K. Brendtro 1201 W. Russel Street PO Box 2583 Sioux Falls, SD 57101-2583 (605) 951-9011 bobt@hovlandrasmus.com dan@brendtrolawfirm.com

and

Dan Rasmus (pro hac pending) HOVLAND & RASMUS, PLLC Southdale Office Centre 6800 France Avenue S., Suite 190 Edina, MN 55435 Phone: (612) 874-8550 drasmus@hovlandrasmus.com Attorneys for Plaintiff

JS 44 (Rev. 02/19)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				HEART HOSPITAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA, LLC, a North Carolina					
RONDA HORSLEY				HEARTHOSPITAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA, LLC, a North Carolina Limited Liability Company, d/b/a, AVERA HEART HOSPITAL OF SOUTH DAKOTA and PAUL E. MEYER, MD.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Woodbury				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Wake					
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				Attorneys (If Known)					
Robert D. Trzynka and Daniel K. Brendtro, Brendtro Law Firm, P.O. Box 2583, Sioux Falls, SD 57101, (605) 951-9011									
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Bax Only)				TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF en of This State O 1 O 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State					
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	3 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citiza	en of Another State	of Another State 🕳 2 🗇 2 Incorporated and I			☐ 5	D 5
				zen or Subject of a					
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Description CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUT									
□ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure		KRUPTCY al 28 USC 158	OTHER S		ES
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury	7	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 With	drawal	376 Qui Tam		
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	ED 69	0 Other	28 U	SC 157	3729(a)) 3729(a)) 400 State Rea	pportions	nent
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical				RTY RIGHTS	🗇 410 Antitrust		
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			☐ 820 Copy ☐ 830 Pater		430 Banks and 450 Commerc		ß
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product				t - Abbreviated Drug Application	460 Deportati 470 Racketees		ed and
(Excludes Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product	Liability			☐ 840 Trade	mark	Corrupt C	rganizati	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud		0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL □ 861 HIA	SECURITY (1395ff)	480 Consume 485 Telephon		пег
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal		Act		CLung (923)	Protectio	n Act	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		0 Labor/Management Relations	3 864 SSID	C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	490 Cable/Sat 850 Securities		dities/
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability		0 Railway Labor Act I Family and Medical	Ø 865 RSI (405(g))	Exchange 890 Other State		ione
	Medical Malpractice	·		Leave Act			☐ 891 Agricultu	ral Acts	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION Ilabeas Corpus;		O Other Labor Litigation U Employee Retirement	_	L TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff	893 Environn 895 Freedom		
220 Foreclosure	① 441 Voting	☐ 463 Alien Detainee	ì	Income Security Act	or D	efendant)	Act		
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	Ì		26 U	-Third Party SC 7609	☐ 896 Arbitratio		cedure
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	530 General 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION			Act/Revie Agency E		real of
D 270 Am Other Real Flopperty	Employment	Other:	□ 46	2 Naturalization Application	1		3 950 Constituti	onality o	f
	446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other	 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 	er 🔯 46	5 Other Immigration Actions			State Stat	utes	
	☐ 448 Education	555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee							
		Conditions of							
II onioni		Confinement							
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) M I Original									
(specify) Transfer Direct File Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. §1332									
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: Medical malpractice and fraud									
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	EMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: A Yes ONo								
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions):									
JODGE DOCKET NUMBER									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY SIGNATOR FOF ATTORNEY OF RECORD									
RECEIPT# AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		